

Date: Fri, 24 Dec 93 04:30:08 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #546
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 24 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 546

Today's Topics:

 ARRL's callsign admin position
 cb dx activity (2 msgs)
 The 10-meters band - No CW required ? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 13 Dec 93 22:10:38 GMT
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_13059.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: ARRL's callsign admin position
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <LHieec2w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan
Pickersgill N8PKV) wrote:

> Again, the ARRL Guys I have met here have been helpfull in the
> EXTREAM!!!! Thank you to ALL you guys (& gals, not to be sexist). And I
> understand that there are CompuServ addresses too. GREAT!

I think you would find them even more so in person. The ARRL headquarters
is *well* worth visiting ifd only for that!

I have been there twice (hopefully again this summer :-), once in 1964, and
again in 1980. The most impressive difference was how everything had
grown! The sheer size of everything was impressive, yet somehow they still
manage to remain very well focused on both amateur radio and the individual

amateur.

I will be interested to see the changes since 1980!

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

Hate is not a "Family Value"

Date: 24 Dec 93 08:10:34 GMT

From: ogicse!hp-cv!hp-pcd!hpcvaac!billn@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: cb dx activity

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

:

: Joe, the person you describe that plays with SSB DX lacks this last quality,
: and knowing some of the characters that have actually gone this route, and show
: no remorse over their poor and illegal judgement, I see a negative kink to the
: Amateur Radio Service that can only spell the mediocritization of our fine
: service.

In my opinion, that happened as soon as they started publishing the question pool. These days, it is totally unnecessary to understand the least bit about radio theory.

Bill

Date: 24 Dec 1993 11:31:15 GMT

From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!xlink.net!scsing.switch.ch!

swidir.switch.ch!univ-lyon1.fr!elendir@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: cb dx activity

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

bill nelson (billn@hpcvaac.cv.hp.com) wrote:

: mark@ve6mgs.ampr.org (Mark G. Salyzyn) writes:

: :

: : Amateur Radio Service that can only spell the mediocritization of our fine
: : service.

: In my opinion, that happened as soon as they started publishing the question
: pool. These days, it is totally unnecessary to understand the least bit about
: radio theory.

: Bill

Do you mean that in the USA, the questions are known in advance ?

73, Vince.

--

PSG Vainqueurs de la coupe de France 1982, 1983, 1993
PSG Champions de France 1985/86 1/2 Finaliste C3: 1993
PSG PARIS SAINT GERMAIN FC --- NOTRE HISTOIRE DEVIENDRA LEGENDE.

Date: 13 Dec 93 22:19:27 GMT
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_13059.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <JuJeec4w165w@mystis.wariat.org>, dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) wrote:

> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:
>
> > Only a fool would want to be given something of value without working
> > for it. Study the history of the hobby and you'll better understand
> > why code is given the special place it deserves.
> >
> > Jeff NH6IL
>
> Hummm... Place it deserves. How about a monument in Washington, were we
> honor all great things of the PAST.
>
> (My appologies Jeff, I _HAD_ to!)

Gee maybe in one of the washrooms of a monument there? Then Jeff can enjoy it together with his favorite people. :-)

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

Hate is not a "Family Value"

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1993 15:49:27 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Xa1yec1w165w@mystis.wariat.org> dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>dadams@cray.com (David Adams) writes:

>>

>> Also, since UPS hasn't put their 220-222 program into place, shouldn't
>> they be subjected to a use it or lose it policy? Can we re-apply for seconda
>> privileges on 220-222?

>

>Maybe the ARRL could lead this one. Sounds like it is something that
>they could do well. (For the general ham population they have claimed
>to represent.) I don't think there are very many hams that would not
>support the return of that spectrum.

Well the FCC isn't going to back out of this one just because UPS
folded their tent, it'd make them look bad. They're now assigning
this spectrum to other uses. However, the ARRL **is** doing something.
They've filed to get secondary status on the 216-220 MHz spectrum for
point to point packet links. If we get this, it's a major win. Remember
we did get **something** out of the 222-225 deal. We're now primary and
exclusive users of this spectrum. We don't have to share with government
anymore. With the way government is intent on auctioning off their parts
of the spectrum, this is a very good thing.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: 13 Dec 93 22:05:58 GMT
From: ftpbox!mothost!schbbs!node_13059.aieg.mot.com!user@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CHt6uM.8qC@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <2eal34\$9fr@chnews.intel.com>,
<CHuun7.J1t@news.Hawaii.Edu>

Subject : Re: ARRL's callsign admin position

In article <CHuun7.J1t@news.Hawaii.Edu>, jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu
(Jeff Herman) wrote:

> >'Radio Amateur's Code':

> >

> >>> *TWO* THE AMATEUR IS LOYAL . . . He owes his amateur radio to the
> >>> American Radio Relay League, and he offers it his unswerving
> >>> loyalty.
> >
> >>You MUST be kidding.
>
> Of course, this was written in the days when amateurs knew and appreciated
> what the ARRL had done to preserve the hobby/service.

Jeff, I'm not sure that is really any different today. It is just not popular to express support for anything positive for some reason.

If I knew why I would either be rich or a fugitive I guess :-)

> I think I'm safe
> in saying if it wasn't for the ARRL amateur radio would not exist
> today. Don't believe it? Study the history and development of the
> hobby - many good enjoyable books available. But I understand, most
> will be too lazy to read some historical accounts - much easier to
> tap out flames on your keyboards.

For once I agree with Jeff. ARRL has saved ham radio many many times, for all its faults ARRL is the only effective "weapon" we have against an uncaring and faceless beauracracy which determines our fates as amateurs.

--

Mike Waters rcrw90@email.mot.com AA4MW@KC7Y.PHX.AZ.US.NA

Hate is not a "Family Value"

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1993 16:13:45 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2fa3ibINN4e0@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,
<1993Dec22.194138.2169@cs.brown.edu>, <2faifbINN4hd@abyss.West.Sun.COM>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <2faifbINN4hd@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM (Dana Myers) writes:

>In article <1993Dec22.194138.2169@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>I still don't understand why a 3rd tier is necessary. What does the
>>addition of "Class C" really solve? Perhaps you could expand on

>>this a little more, as I'm confused.

>

>I propose Class C to deal with the case someone is given Class B privileges
>but is not given credit for the Class B written exam. This would be the
>case for grandfathered Novice/Techs in your proposal. It is meant as
>a migration item, and would eventually disappear.

Sigh. That's why I originally proposed just grandfathering the Tech/Novice
to full class B. I knew someone would say "Ah ha, something for nothing,
we gotta stop that!" Look, live with it. Any time there are changes there
are winners and losers. With my proposal, current Tech/Novices are winners,
but, and this is key, *there aren't any current licensees who are losers*.
That makes it politically possible. We need to quit worrying about the other
guy's gain. No current licensee gets hurt with grandfathering. *New* class
B applicants will have to work harder than some existing licensees, but
that's their tough luck, they could have jumped into amateur radio earlier.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1993 16:01:21 GMT

From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!

gary@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Dec22.015119.21144@anomaly.sbs.com> ,

<1993Dec22.114826.15329@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> ,

<1993Dec22.195108.21944@Csl.Stanford.EDU>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec22.195108.21944@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>

>>I propose that all new licensees receive a sequential block D

>>callsign, and be allowed to apply for an available "vanity"

>>callsign in any of the blocks after one year.

>

>Sounds good; I'd make it three years instead of one, to make sure the person

>occupying good call is actually likely to use it.

Well I actually thought of making it at the first license renewal, but that's 10 years now. I think anyone who still wants a vanity call after 1 year is well hooked. Most inactives lose interest before that.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Thu, 23 Dec 1993 15:58:42 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!ke4zv!
gary@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <931220.05633.EDELLERS@delphi.com>, <2w2yec4w165w@mystis.wariat.org>,
<1993Dec22.194519.21784@Csl.Stanford.EDU>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec22.194519.21784@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

>dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>

>>And the simple reason is that there is no GOOD argument for keeping the
>>code requirement on HF. So the "whiners" argument wins by default.

>

>And the simple reason is that there are plenty of technical justifications for
>keeping the code requirement on HF. So the "whiners" argument wins by default.

Sorry, all the technical justifications for the *use* of manual Morse on HF have nothing to do with license *exams*. Manual Morse may have it's uses, but so do all the other modes, including compatable automatic Morse. (Yeah I know, the available automated stuff doesn't work as well as a highly conditioned wetware modem, but so what? The guys who don't do it in wetware just won't work as many weak ones. That's *their* problem, not your's, or the FCC's.)

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #546
